

More Lies and Ignorance of a Hizb at-Tahrîr Representative in Canada

By Abû Huthayfah al-Kanadî

After reading an article entitled “Lies and Ignorance of Hizbut Tahrîr in the Sciences of Ḥadîth and the Arabic Language”, a back and forth between the author and the subject of the article from about a year ago, and then a recently released “response” by the subject of the article, I felt compelled to write these short observations. After this paragraph, the “response” from the subject of the article is in black and my words are in colour.

An old, shallow, and quite-frankly misleading article that was written some time ago regarding the opinion of Hizb ut Tahrir on the definition of a Sahabi - titled "The Lies and Ignorance of Hizb ut Tahrir In the Sciences of Hadith and the Arabic Language" - has resurfaced.

I like how colorful adjectives, such as “old, shallow and quite-frankly misleading” are a substitution for academic research and authentic references. Interesting how an article’s age (i.e. old) has any bearing on its validity or truth. Incidentally, it’s about year old. Maybe a year makes something “old” to you. But ok, here we go...

The article mostly refers to my own Facebook posts and comments (as if my Facebook posts are Hizb ut Tahrir canon), and only gives a cursory glance at what is explained in the adopted books of Hizb ut Tahrir, which is disappointing and somewhat lazy.

Hizb ut Tahrir “canon”? Really? Ok, for the sake of the discussion, let’s assume this group has some immense “canon” of thorough research to rely upon. Why didn’t you refer to it in your reply? It seems that if you were so interested in refuting the alleged false claims in the article, it should have been simple enough for you to dip into this expansive “canon” to produce a decisive rebuttal of the errors in the article. Incidentally, I and others, are still waiting for that...

Either way, below are 5 main problems with the article:

1- The title of the article

The author seems to think that it is ok to accuse someone of "lying" when it is simply a matter of valid differences in the interpretation of the evidences. A more respectful choice of words would have been something along the lines of "incorrect conclusions" instead of "lies," and "weak opinions" instead of "ignorance." But some people still have not yet learned the etiquette of Islamic discourse yet.

Perhaps the author believes you lied and weren’t simply following “incorrect conclusions”. Perhaps he believes you are ignorant were not merely following “weak opinions”. Is it impossible for you to fathom that someone believes you lied or are ignorant? Allâh knows you’ve provided enough fodder for that claim.

Interesting, how easily you refer to his words as “ignorant”, “shallow”, “juvenile” and “slander” and say that you “lack self control (*sic*) or maturity”, without any consideration of disrespectful they are, but at the same time, be so morally outraged by identical words or others, which are even less harsh. Does this indicate self-control and maturity? I wonder. And anyone who follows your page and sees how you deal with people who challenge you, will notice that this is your go to response; to be so offended as to not be able to continue the discussion with people who are too “immature”, or whatever excuse you choose to use that day.

To address the insulting and juvenile title, I will simply say that it is well known by those who have studied the sciences of the Deen that - as stated by Al-Mirwazi - the Muhadditheen (scholars of Hadith) define a Sahabi as anyone who saw the Prophet (saw) and died a Muslim, while the Usooli (legislative Usool Al-Fiqh) scholars define a Sahabi as those who lived with the Prophet (saw) and mixed with him a great deal while following his behavior and taking from him.

Who is Al-Mirwazi? I think you mean Al-Marwazî?

“...those who have studied the sciences of the Deen...” Were the sources referenced coming from those who have not done so? Or is it only those who reference your vast “canon” of Hizb ut Tahrir verified and confirmed academic research who can wear this crown of achievement?

Here is the Arabic quote by Al-Mirwazi:

From Al-Marwazî.

أصحاب الحديث يطلقون اسم الصحابة على كل من روى عنه حديثاً أو كلمة ، ويتوسعون حتى يعدون من رآه رؤية من " الصحابة ، وهذا لشرف منزلة النبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - أعطوا كل من رآه حكم الصحبة " ... "اسم الصحابي - من حيث اللغة ، والظاهر - يقع على من طالت صحبته للنبي - صلى الله عليه وسلم - وكثرت مجالسته له على طريق التبعية له والأخذ به " عنه " قال : " وهذا طريق الأصوليين .

So, I suggest this author take a deeper look at the history of this topic, and learn to use more appropriate wording to describe something that the scholars have long discussed and is a known issue. Children use words like "liar" to refer to disagreements, whereas mature adults will use words like "correct opinion" and "incorrect opinion" in such matters.

It's strange that the main reference which seems to be used by you and your fans is the Muqaddimah of Ibn as-Salâh.

And again, perhaps people know the difference between the use of lie and “incorrect opinion”, and simply believe you lied.

2- The definition of a Sahabi

He quotes a Hadith in Sahih Al-Bukhari, narrated by Abu Sa'eed Al-Khudri that mentions the word صاحب ("was a companion to") the Prophet (saw). Then he quotes a second Hadith in Sahih Muslim narrated by the same narrator that uses the word رأى ("seen") the Prophet (saw). But the author does not seem to understand that the definition of a Sahabi is an assessment of the practical reality of a "companion."

This is precisely why you were called out on your nonsense. This is another claim devoid of any evidence whatsoever. You continue to make the same claim, over-and-over, despite having been proven wrong about it. Claiming that the definition of a Sahabi is such-and-such, when it was clearly demonstrated, using an authentic Arabic text of the Sahâbah using this exact same word in a completely contrary word to how you have attempted to redefine it, is futile.

You did this last year: completely ignored something in the article, and pretended it wasn't addressed. This was when you claimed the author didn't address the narration of Sa'îd Ibn Jubayr, despite the fact that numerous pages were dedicated to addressing it. Perhaps you know your followers don't verify anything and hope it will all just go away.

It is not a textual assessment, and none of the classical scholars said it was anything more than an assessment of the nature of a "companion," where they simply believed that seeing the Prophet (saw) was enough to transform a human being into a just individual, as long as that person maintained the transformation and died in that state.

Notice how you omit the most important part of the correct Islâmic definition of a Sahâbî. You said: "...seeing the Prophet (saw)..." while clearly omitting "...while believing in him", as if any of the Mushrikîn who merely saw the Messenger of Allâh, but referred to him as a liar, a soothsayer, an insane person would somehow qualify as a Sahâbî. Is this the result of your access to the vast "canon" of Hizb ut Tahrir academia? Is it a result of your impressive knowledge of the Arabic language? Perhaps this omission came from your striking knowledge of Usûl al-Fiqh.

Or, more likely, you are a person who was proven wrong, remain wrong, and have crawled back out to reclaim some dignity, after embarrassing yourself last year.

In other words, when a word is used, the word originally has a linguistic meaning with an associated reality (called حقيقة لغوية). That associated reality remains the meaning of the word unless a text from the Deen changes the associated reality to another associated reality, which makes the word now have a "Shari'ee meaning". So, for example, the word "Salat" was associated with the reality of "connecting one thing with another," and in pre-Islamic Arabia it was associated with "making du'a." But Islam was revealed and changed the associated reality from those things to the reality of the 5 obligatory prayers.

Here, you are embarrassing yourself again. Either you have forgotten the discussion, or you are deliberately seeking to change it. Originally, it was you who stated that this definition was based on the Arabic meaning of the word. As you said:

"We define a Sahabi as someone who fulfills the linguistic meaning of a 'companion.'"

And again, you said: "...whereas our opinion is at least based on the linguistic meaning of Suhba (companionship)."

So when you were clearly proven wrong, instead of saying: "Oh, I guess I didn't know what I assumed I knew," you attempt to shift your claims to the definition of the so-called **nature of a "companion,"** which is a claim not only devoid of any scholarly proof, it also has no textual evidence to substantiate it whatsoever.

Therefore, in the context of the word "Sahabi," the associated reality is "companionship," and the texts of Islam did not change the associated reality to anything other than companionship. Therefore it remains an assessment of what is a "companion," and not some alternate meaning to the meaning Sahabi. Some scholars said seeing the Prophet (saw) was enough to be considered his companion, and others said that living with him, learning from him, and/or fighting alongside him was required to fulfill the meaning of companionship.

Amazingly, all of these statements were disproven last year; particularly the claim that this term can be redefined as an "associated reality". Not only were no evidences provided to substantiate this claim, all the necessary evidences to disprove it were provided.

As for the adopted opinion of Hizb ut Tahrir on this matter, it can be found in our book The Islamic Personality Part 1, under the chapter titled "The Transmitters of Hadith" or in Arabic **رُواة الحديث**.

Link to the Arabic book: http://www.hizb-ut-tahrir.org/.../ar_books_pdf/Shakhsiyah1.pdf

Link to the English book: <http://www.hizb-australia.org/.../up.../2012/03/Shakhsiyya-I.pdf>

As for a decisive refutation these lies (specifically "*Ash-Shakhsīyyah al-Islāmiyyah*", Vol 1/323), and particularly the false claims of Mazin AbdulAdhim, then this is available here:

Link to the PDF document:

<https://archive.org/download/LieAndIgnoranceOfHizbutTahreerInTheSciencesOfHadeethAndTheArabicLanguage/Lie%20and%20Ignorance%20of%20Hizbut-Tahreer%20In%20the%20Sciences%20of%20Hadeeth%20and%20the%20Arabic%20Language.pdf>

Link to the Word document:

<https://archive.org/download/LieAndIgnoranceOfHizbutTahreerInTheSciencesOfHadeethAndTheArabicLanguage/Lie%20and%20Ignorance%20of%20Hizbut-Tahreer%20In%20the%20Sciences%20of%20Hadeeth%20and%20the%20Arabic%20Language.docx>

The bottom line is this is an issue of Ijtihad and Ikhtilaaf - and the author even quotes Ibn Al-Salah who clearly states that it is a disputed issue and there are many valid opinions, which he conveniently ignored - so we should take it easy, and understand that Islam permits differences of opinion on Ijtihadi issues.

So now suddenly this matter is an Ijtihâdî issue, and a matter of legitimate Ikhtilâf? What happened to your laughable claim from last year, where you described the correct opinion as follows?

As you said: “This opinion is a mystical assumption about the effect of seeing the Prophet (saw) and actually has no basis in the texts of Islam.”

Is this the position of someone who considers the opposing position to be a legitimate differing view? Is referring to an opinion as “a mystical assumption”, how you describe issues of Ijtihâd?

3- The claim that Hizb ut Tahrir defines Shari'ee matters based on English translations

He claims that we take the translated meanings from English and define our understanding from that. Either this author knows nothing about Shaykh Taqiuddin An-Nabahani or he is intentionally attempting to mislead the reader. Only someone who knows nothing about Hizb ut Tahrir would think that our adopted opinions are based on English translations.

Either you can't read, or your memory is faulty. This is what the article said, verbatim:

I say: It appears that this individual did what many do when discussing matters related to rulings based upon the Arabic language; they take the translated meaning in English and apply it to the Arabic language and assume this fulfills the claim of “linguistic meaning”.

Therefore, not only did the author not refer to Hizb at-Tahrîr, nor its founder, he referred to you. It even referred to you as an “individual” and then said you do what some others do. And not only was it completely correct in claiming so, your elementary attempt to use the Arabic language to define something in the Sharî'ah became a clear proof that you do exactly what the author said.

In fact, right after that statement, the author said: “Or, they take the way a word is used in Arabic today and apply this understanding to the way it was used by the early generations. And it is likely that he followed this second method, because this is what was done by his predecessors within his party, as will be seen.”

Even as a third party, I have to say you lied here. You said the author “claims that we take the translated meanings from English and define our understanding from that.” He affirmed the exact opposite.

Ironically, after rejecting the idea that the meaning of a Sahabi is taken from the linguistic meaning of the word...

This is becoming embarrassing. The article literally did the opposite of what you are claiming. Not only did it **NOT** deny that the meaning of a Sahâbî was taken from the Arabic meaning, it clearly and precisely demonstrated that the Arabic meaning of the word of *Ṣuḥbah* is **NOT** what you claimed, which is that it only applies to someone who accompanies another person for some minimum threshold of time.

Pages 3 – 5 of the article you are attempting to reply to more than clearly demonstrates that your understanding of the Arabic meaning of the word you are trying to define was entirely wrong to begin with. I can't say I'm really surprised, but I honestly hope it's because you neglected to read what you are trying to refute, and not simply because you lack the ability to comprehend what you were even discussing.

the author then quotes a few Ahadith that use the linguistic meaning of "Suhba" (companionship) to prove that the use of such a word to describe someone means he is a Sahabi. He then attempts to twist the Hadith to somehow mean "seeing" is equivalent to "Suhba," which it is not.

Actually, the more I read from your feeble attempts to describe the points in the article, the more I'm convinced that you have some type of clinical short-term memory loss, where you're simply unable to retain recently-acquired facts.

Very simply (to make it easy for you), the article demonstrated, with authentic texts (pages 1-2), that 'accompany' and 'see' are synonymous in the texts of the Sharī'ah, and that (pages 3-5), the term Sahâbî is defined in the Arabic language, as well as the Sharī'ah as being in one's company even one single time. There is no way to put this gently. Either you are lying about having read what you are trying to refute, or you are intellectually incapable of understanding it. There is no third option.

It seems the author does not comprehend the fact that you can still use the word *صحب* and its variants to describe all sorts of things not exclusive to the Shar'iee definition of who is a Sahabi. For example, you can use the word "صل" (connect) while referring to connecting with family members, and this does not affect the definition of what *صلاة* (Salat) is, despite coming from the same root word.

The definition of a Sahabi is not dependent on someone saying things like "we accompanied *صحبنا* the Prophet in prayer" as mentioned in the Hadith quoted by the author. That is simply a common linguistic expression. If we wish to define a Sahabi, we must look at the reality and evidences that qualify one to the status of a Sahabi.

Poor guy. I will remind you of what **YOU**, yourself said:

“We define a Sahabi as someone who fulfills the linguistic meaning of a ‘companion.’”

And again, you said: “...whereas our opinion is at least based on the linguistic meaning of Suhba (companionship).”

Therefore, you – not me – **YOU** are the one saying that the term ‘Sahâbî’ is someone who fulfills the linguistic meaning of a ‘companion’. That is precisely why the article FIRST demonstrated that someone who sees someone is the same as someone who is their companion, based upon their accompanying them (*Ṣāḥiba*), in the **ARABIC LANGUAGE**. Got it? Probably not, but there’s always hope.

Likewise, the article doesn’t quote a *Hadîth* saying "we accompanied صاحبنا the Prophet in prayer" as you falsely claimed. Do you intentionally add words, or just have trouble reading and writing?

Each time you discuss matters of the Arabic language, you show how little grasp you have on it.

Also, the definition, when it comes to the Companions of the Prophet, was changed by the *Sharî’ah*. This is evident in the texts quoted in the article. So your whole attempt to show how SOMETIMES it can change, but still have tie to the original meaning, shows that you completely missed the point.

And the reason صاحب was used as an example to show the tie is because the way someone becomes someone’s companion is by accompanying them. Look to the books that catalogue the Arabic language and you’ll find the following or some variation of it:

صحب ، يصحب ، صحابة ، وصحبة ، فهو صاحب

Sahiba Yas’habu Sahâbatan Wa Suhbatan Fahuwa Sâhib

He accompanied, he accompanies, company and companionship so he is a companion

As for the narration by Ibn Abbas (ra) regarding Mu’awiyah having accompanied the Prophet (saw), this is the opinion of Ibn Abbas. We do not pretend that there is no difference of opinion on this issue. It is no different to quoting the differences among the Sahaba regarding the sighting of the Hilal of Ramadhan or Shawwal. Quoting the opinion of a Sahabi is not an evidence - but it is perfectly acceptable to follow that opinion, since the Sahaba are like the stars, whichever you follow will guide you. We simply have a different opinion on the matter, and it seems the author is having a hard time wrapping his head around the idea that people sometimes disagree in Thanni matters in the Deen.

He was an Arab, in an area and time before the Arabic language was used, using an Arabic word. It’s not a matter of opinion so much as it is proof of the meaning of a word. You know, how we find out what a word means by looking to how the Arabic used it.

And let's ignore that you are attributing the statement of Ibn 'Abbâs (raa) as merely his opinion. Can you point to any opposing opinion regarding whether Mu'âwiyah (raa) accompanied the Prophet (saas)? Since you are claiming this is some famously difference of opinion, surely it should be simple enough for you to produce even one other Sahâbî who differed with Ibn 'Abbâs (raa). Perhaps if you search in the vast "canon" of the academia of Hizb at-Tahrîr, you will be able to bring it. We're waiting...

4- The "weak" narration

I like how throwing quotations around a word, casually implies that the word itself is wrong. As if by writing "weak", the author is trying to imply that the narration is actually authentic.

Let's take a look at Mazin's "knowledge":

Halfway through the document, he finally quotes an excerpt from an adopted book by the Hizb, and then immediately dismisses the narration quoted within it as "having no reference"

Wait? Was there a mistake? Was there any reference made in the book by Hizb at-Tahrîr to the source of this quote? If so, please produce it. Please show us on which page or footnote this reference was made in the book you are referring to. I'd like to see it...

and then moves on to attack a Facebook comment I made. Then he later comes back and says it has a source,

Yes, that's what was done. The author found your unnamed source and clarified the correct reference, which your group's book left unnamed. Believe me, from a research and academic point-of-view, this is not something that makes the article look bad. Quite the opposite, in fact.

and then spends multiple pages "refuting" the chain of narrators.

I'm not sure how exactly one "refutes" a chain of narrators. Pointing out the weakness of a chain is one thing – and yes, I did do that – but refuting it?

The narration is as follows:

عن شعبة عن موسى السبلاني - وأثنى عليه خيرا - قال : أتيت أنس بن مالك فقلت : هل بقي من أصحاب رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - أحد غيرك ؟ قال : " بقي ناس من الأعراب قد رأوه ، فأما من صحبه فلا " . إسناده جيد ، حدث به مسلم بحضرة أبي زرعة

Narrated by Ibn Al-Salah in Uloom Al-Hadith, that Shu'bah narrated from Musa Al-Sambulani (also known as Al-Sablani and Al-Saylani), who said: "I said to Anas Ibn Mâlik: 'Is there anyone remaining from the Companions of the Messenger of Allah other than you?' He said: 'There remains people from among the Bedouins who saw him. But as for those who accompanied him (صَحْبِهِ), then no'." It is graded as good, and Imam Muslim narrated from him.

The bottom line is it is graded as "Jayyid" by the Muhaddith, which is a grade higher than Hasan and lesser than Sahih; and we also accept the chain of narration as authentic. Sure, there are some who disagree with its authenticity, but there is disagreement on the grading of many Hasan and even Sahih Ahadith in Abu Dawood, Al-Tirmithi, and so on.

But to call someone who concludes that this narration is authentic a "liar," that is simply juvenile and shows a lack of depth in the history of Ijtihad in the Deen.

This is pretty dumb. The fact that since someone said its chain is "Jayyid", and there are disputed *Hadith* in books, there's no responsibility to prove the authenticity of what you quote? And I don't believe you were called a liar for accepting that narration. But maybe I'm as inattentive as you and missed it.

5- Mu'awiyah bin Abi Sufyan

Three things here:

- a) First of all, just to clear something up, when I said that his narrations are a duplicate of other Ahadith without him, I meant in the content, not the wording; in other words, the Hukum included in his narrations are found in other Ahadith, so the Deen has lost nothing of laws and guidance if we excluded his narrations, since those laws and guidance are found in other narrations.

Another example of your inability to read, or at least to comprehend... This false claim was already responded to on page 14 of the article:

"Now, they may claim that the meaning of these Aḥādīth has come in Aḥādīth from other Ṣaḥābah, even if the exact wording has not come from them. I say: This is indeed the case for some of the Aḥādīth, but not all of them."

"And even for those which there are other Aḥādīth with the same meaning or a similar meaning, the fact of the matter is that Mu'āwiyah is the sole narrator of these Aḥādīth, which disproves this laughable claim."

b) Second, this isn't about Mu'awiyah. It is about the definition of a Sahabi.

And again... as was already pointed out:

As for the claim that this has nothing to do with Mu'āwiyah and that this group does not hold an opinion regarding Mu'āwiyah, then I say: This does not appear to be true. The reason for this is that they discuss Mu'āwiyah and his not being one of the Ṣaḥābah in their own publications. In fact, the issue of the definition of what a Ṣaḥābī appears in this very context. Therefore, they have no one to blame for this inference, if indeed it is merely an inference and incorrect, but themselves.

In fact, their previous definition of a Ṣaḥâbî comes in this exact context. “The Ṣaḥâbî and all those whom the meaning of Ṣuḥbah is present in – and it has been explained that if he accompanies the Prophet, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, for a year or two, and battled alongside him in a battle or two. And Mu’âwiyah entered Islâm when his age was 13 years old. And it is not narrated that he went to Al-Madînah and lived in it during the lifetime of the Messenger, صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, and accompanied him. And the Messenger stayed in Makkah for a short amount of time the likes of which the meaning of Ṣuḥbah cannot take place in. Therefore, Mu’âwiyah was not a Ṣaḥâbî.” [“Al-Malaff al-Fikrî”, pg. 148]

Haven’t you noticed that your recent responses here were already shut down a year ago? This is a thing that happens when people are unable or unwilling to follow the thread of a discussion or debate; they resort to repeating claims, which have already been completely debunked by their opposition. You are only calling attention to the fact that your claims were previously disproven, and yet you persist in making them, while adding nothing new to substantiate them.

- b) And third - since this issue has come up again, so let's discuss Mu'awiyah now - I've honestly had enough of this excessive praising of Mu'awiyah by these people who seem to be willingly blind to history. Therefore, to correct their skewed perspective, I will simply list the Sahih narrations in Sahih Al-Bukhari and other reliable books of narration regarding him, and you can make your own mind up on the matter. The full list of the narrations are below in the first two comments:

And here we go... Thank you! After all your dishonesty... After all your fruitless attempts to appear neutral and objective about a simple matter of Fiqh and Usûl... After claiming that this position has nothing personal whatsoever to do with *Amîr al-Mu’minîn*, Mu’âwiyah Ibn Abî Sufyân, (رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ), you **FINALLY** are forced to reveal what everyone already knew... that you have a personal issue with him (raa) and you cannot bear to accept him being considered a Sahâbî. We already knew it, despite your denials, because – let’s face it – you weren’t even really trying very hard to hide it anyway.

Essentially, what you end up saying, to confess your real objective and your true motives, is this (and I am barely paraphrasing here):

“Ok fine! Do you really want to know what this is about?! Let me show you something about your precious Mu’âwiyah! Take a look at these! Now can you see why I’m unwilling to call him a Sahâbî? Now can you see why I pretended this was some innocent issue of Ijtihâd or legitimate difference of opinion?! Now can you see how fake I was to pretend I had some kind of scholarly objection to your definition of a Sahâbî?!”

You have finally revealed yourself as the complete disingenuous fraud you are. I’m only sorry it took a year for you to publicly confess what everyone already knew. You hate this Sahâbî and you are not able to allow yourself to accept him as someone who is insulated by that description or that label. So rather than just simply admitting that you hate one of the Sahâbah,

as the Shī'ah do, you disguise your hatred as if it has some Fiqh or Usûl basis, which it absolutely, 100% does not.

The Shī'ah reinvented history in order to justify their hatred of the Sahâbah, whereas you reinvent Fiqh and Usûl to do the same thing. After all your sanctimonious, moral outrage with the word "lie" or "liar", the least of things you are eligible to be called is a liar – may Allâh grant you what you deserve!

- Narrated by Al-Bukhari:

روى البخاري (447) و (2812) ومسلم (2916) بألفاظ عدة وهذا لفظ البخاري في الموضع الأول، قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: عمار تقتله الفئة الباغية يدعوهم إلى الجنة ويدعونه إلى النار

Rasool Allah (saw) said: "Ammar will be killed by the rebellious faction; he will call them to Jannah, and they will call him to the Fire." (Note that Mu'awiyah's army killed Ammar during the Battle of the Camel)

- Narrated in Musnad Ahmed:

: فقد روى أحمد في المسند (323/6) بسند صحيح عن أبي عبد الله الجدلي قال دخلت على أم سلمة فقالت لي: أَيْسَبُّ رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم فيكم؟! قلت: معاذ الله أو سبحان الله أو كلمة نحوها! قالت: سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم يقول: من سب علياً فقد سبني

Abu Abdullah Al-Jadli said: "Umm Salama entered and asked me 'Is the Messenger of Allah (saw) being insulted among you?!' I said 'I seek refuge in Allah from such a thing!' She said 'I heard the Messenger of Allah (saw) say 'Whoever insulted Ali has insulted me' (referring to Mu'awiyah insulting Ali on the Minbar)."

- Narrated in Al-Mustadrak, graded as Sahih:

أن عبادة بن الصامت قام قائماً في وسط دار أمير المؤمنين عثمان بن عفان رضي الله عنه ؛ فقال : إني سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم محمداً أبا القاسم يقول : (سيأتي أموركم من بعدي رجال يُعَرِّفُونَكُمْ ما تنكرون ، وينكرون عليكم ما تعرفون ، فلا طاعة لمن عصى الله) فوالذي نفسي بيده إن معاوية من أولئك فما راجعه عثمان حرفاً

"Ubadah bin Al-Saamit spoke in the middle of the house of Ameer Al-Mu'mineen Uthman bin Affan and said 'I heard the Messenger of Allah (saw) say: 'After me there will be men who will do things you know are wrong, and condemn you for things you know are right, so do not obey those who disobey Allah.' And by the One whose Hand my soul is in, Mu'awiyah is among them.' And Uthman did not disagree with him even with a single word."

- Narrated in Musnad Ahmed:

عن عبد الله بن بُرَيْدَةَ قَالَ : دَخَلْتُ أَنَا وَأَبِي عَلَى مُعَاوِيَةَ فَأَجْلَسَنَا عَلَى الْفُرْشِ ثُمَّ أُتِينَا بِالطَّعَامِ فَأَكَلْنَا ثُمَّ أُتِينَا بِالشَّرَابِ فَشَرَبْنَا مُعَاوِيَةَ ثُمَّ نَأْوَلُ أَبِي فَقَالَ : مَا شَرِبْتُهُ مُنْذُ حَرَمَهُ رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم

Abdullah bin Buraydah said: "My father and I entered upon Mu'awiyah and we sat down with him, so he brought us food and we ate, then he brought us drink, and he drank, and then he offered some to my father, and my father said 'I have not drank that since the Messenger of Allah (saw) forbade it'."

- Narrated by Imam Malik and An-Nasa'iee:

أخرج مالك رقم 1321 والنسائي وغيرهما من طريق عطاء بن يسار: إن معاوية باع سقاية من ذهب أو ورق بأكثر من وزنها فقال له أبو الدرداء رضي الله عنه: سمعت رسول الله عن مثل هذا إلا مثلاً بمثل فقال معاوية: ما أرى بهذا بأساً فقال أبو الدرداء: من يعذرني من معاوية؟ أنا أخبره عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه واله وسلم وهو يخبرني عن رأيه، لا أساكنك بأرض أنت بها

Ataa' bin Yassar said: "Mu'awiyah sold some gold or silver for more than the value of its weight (which is Haram). Abu Ad-Dardaa' (ra) said 'I heard the Messenger of Allah (saw) regarding these things (gold and silver) that they must be traded only in like.' Mu'awiyah said 'I don't see anything wrong with this.' Abu Ad-Dardaa' said 'Who will excuse me from Mu'awiyah? I tell him of what Rasool Allah (saw) said, and he responds with his own opinion. I will not live on the same land as you."

- Imam Al-Shafi'iee narrates in his book Al-Umm:

أخرج الشافعي في كتابه " الأم 94/1 من طريق عبيدة بن رفاع قال: أن معاوية قدم المدينة فصلى بهم فلم يقرأ بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم ولم يكبر إذا خفض وإذا رفع، فناداه المهاجرون حين سلم والأنصار: أن يا معاوية! سرقت صلاتك؟ أين بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم؟ وأين التكبير إذا خفضت وإذا رفعت؟ فصلى بهم صلاة أخرى، فقال: ذلك فيما الذي عابوا عليه

Ubaidah bin Rufa'ah said: "Mu'awiyah entered Madinah and led the prayer, and he did not recite the Bismillah and did not say the Takbeer when he performed Rukoo' or say anything when he rose from Rukoo'. When he was done the Salat, the Muhajireen and the Ansar said 'Mu'awiyah, did you steal from your Salat? Where was the Bismillah? And where was the Takbeer?' So he led them in prayer again; and this is one of the things they continued to hold against him."

- Al-Bayhaqi narrates:

عن سعيد بن جبير قال: كنا عند بن عباس بعرفة فقال يا سعيد مالي لا أسمع الناس يلبون فقلتُ يخافون معاوية فخرج بن عباس من فسطاطه فقال: لبيك اللهم لبيك وإن رغم أنف معاوية اللهم عنهم فقد تركوا السنة من بغض علي رضي الله عنه

Sa'eed bin Jubayr said: "I was with Ibn Abbas at Arafah and he said to me: 'Sa'eed, why don't I hear people saying Labbayk?' I said 'They are afraid of Mu'awiyah.' So Ibn Abbas went out and called out 'Labbayk Allahuma Labayk! In spite of Mu'awiyah! Oh Allah curse them, for they have left the Sunnah due to their hatred of Ali!'"

And in the version narrated by An-Nasa'iee:

عن سعيد بن جبير قال كنا مع بن عباس بعرفات فقال مالي لا أسمع الناس يلبون فقلت يخافون من معاوية فخرج بن عباس من فسطاطه فقال لبيك اللهم لبيك فإنهم قد تركوا السنة من بغض علي

Sa'eed bin Jubayr said: "I was with Ibn Abbas at Arafah and he said to me: 'Why don't I hear people saying Labbayk?' I said 'They are afraid of Mu'awiyah.' So Ibn Abbas went out and called out 'Labbayk Allahuma Labayk! They have left the Sunnah due to their hatred of Ali!'"

- Narrated by Imam Muslim:

روى مسلم في الصحيح (1844) وغيره عن عبد الرحمن بن عبد رب الكعبة أنه قال لعبد الله بن عمرو بن العاص : هذا ابن عمك معاوية يأمرنا أن نأكل أموالنا بيننا بالباطل ونقتل أنفسنا ، والله تعالى يقول : يا أيها الذين آمنوا لا تأكلوا أموالكم بينكم بالباطل إلا أن تكون تجارة عن تراض منكم ولا تقتلوا أنفسكم إن الله كان بكم رحيماً. قال : فسكت ساعة ثم قال : أطعه في طاعة الله وواعصه في معصية الله .

Abdul-Rahmab bin Rabb Al-Ka'ba said to Abdullah bin Amr bin Al-Aas: "Your cousin Mu'awiyah is ordering us to eat our wealth among us unjustly and to kill each other, and Allah said 'O you who believe, do not eat your wealth among you unjustly, except through trade that you are in agreement upon, and do not kill each other; truly, your Lord is Merciful to you.' So Abdullah bin Amr was silent for a long time and then said 'Obey him in the obedience of Allah, and disobey him in the disobedience of Allah'."

- Narrated by Imam Muslim:

روى مسلم في الصحيح (2604) عن سيدنا ابن عباس رضي الله تعالى عنهما أن النبي صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم قال له : اذهب وادع لي معاوية ؛ قال : فجئت فقلت : هو يأكل ، قال : ثم قال لي : اذهب فادع لي معاوية ؛ قال : فجئت فقلت : هو يأكل فقال : لا أشبع الله بطنه

"The Prophet (saw) said to Ibn Abbas 'Go and bring me Mu'awiyah.' So he went and came back and said 'He is eating.' So the Prophet (saw) told him 'Go and bring me Mu'awiyah.' So he went and came back and said 'He is eating.' So the Messenger of Allah (saw) said 'May Allah cause him to never be full'." (Note that there are many narrations about the large quantities that Mu'awiyah used to eat, and he used to complain that he did not ever feel full)

- Ibn Abbas (ra) said: his cursed tree is Bani Umayyah, as noted in Al-Qurtubi (although Al-Qurtubi disagreed with it):

قال القرطبي : في الجامع لأحكام القرآن 286/10 في تفسير قوله تعالى (والشجرة الملعونة) قال بن عباس : هذه الشجرة بنو أمية .

"Al-Qurtubi said in his Tafseer of (the verse), that Ibn Abbas said: This cursed tree is Bani Umayyah."

And there is much more.

You didn't even need this much to reveal how much of a deceitful, treacherous and fake you truly are, but this certainly helped. Your hateful, Râfidhî roots are more than showing now! Thanks for doing the leg work for me on this one. And when did the article claim anything about Mu'âwiyah being free from blame, the best Companion, one of the best, or anything that would be disproven by any of the narrations you quoted? The point of the article was to prove your lies and ignorance. Are you unable to stay on topic?

So, in conclusion: Let's not be willfully ignorant of our history. The classical scholars defended Mu'awiyah because he was being used by corrupt sects as a way to attack the Sunni Madhaahib. And let's not forget that everyone agrees that Mu'awiyah was the first Khaleefah to corrupt the Bay'ah, and was not among the Khulafaa Al-Rashideen.

Let me be completely frank with you, you delusional freakshow... People like you... people who LIE about the Dîn of Allâh... people who distort the Sharî'ah, while claiming to be sincere with the most disingenuous, fake, treacherous tongues, will NEVER establish the Khilâfah on this Earth! Never!

Reprobates like you, who twist the Sharî'ah of Allâh, are not fit to establish its administration, its governance or its authority. Rather, people like you are the reason the Khilâfah fell in the first place, due to your innovations, desires and false sincerity!

But I repeat that this issue isn't about him. It's about the definition of a Sahabi.

And there is valid difference of opinion within it, and the principle states:

لا انكار في مسائل الاجتهاد

"There is no total rejection (of the other opinion) when it comes to Ijtihaadi matters."

LOL!!!! I love it. After all that, you are so deluded that you still try to claim this!?? I'm so pleased you tried to throw this in at the end, so that people could see how fake you are!